

I think it has been very clearly stated that if this legislation was free from those three additional kinds of riders that really are not directly germane to the appropriations bill, that the legislation and the funding would go ahead on a voice vote.

So I am hopeful that we will be able to address a clean bill. After what I think is a very decisive vote in the Senate, it ought to be a very clear message about what the impediments are toward reaching a final, positive conclusion. If it is the desire of the leadership in the House and the Senate to really respond to the very critical needs of the District, which have been outlined in great detail by the Senator from Vermont, we would take the opportunity to remove those various provisions and see this appropriations bill move ahead.

Clearly, if that is not the case, we will have a responsibility—and I will join with the Senator from Vermont; I know I speak with Senator COATS, Senator MURRAY, and others who spoke and voted against the cloture motion—to make sure that we move this appropriation along with the other unfinished business and the other appropriations as well.

That is our commitment, and it has always been our commitment, in expressing our reservations about the policy decisions. It remains our commitment.

We look forward to working with the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Vermont, in ways that can be helpful to him and, most important, be helpful to the citizens of the District of Columbia.

#### CUBA POLICY

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, the entire world is now aware of Fidel Castro's attack on unarmed American civilian aircraft in international airspace. The U.S. Coast Guard has now called off its search for survivors. Four American citizens have been murdered by Fidel Castro's fighter jets. Brothers to the Rescue is a Florida-based humanitarian group which flies the straits of Florida searching for the desperate product of Fidel Castro's Communist system: refugees in makeshift boats seeking to escape repression. For these efforts, four Americans gave their lives. It is time to honor their memory with real action against Fidel Castro's tyranny.

The apologists for Fidel Castro have already come up with excuses—Brothers to the Rescue had penetrated Cuban airspace in the past, Cuban flight control personnel gave warnings, and on and on. It now appears that Castro even has a planted double agent who will perform a theater of absurd for the world.

But these diversions cannot obscure the basic reality. The reality is there can be no excuse for this act of aggression. The reality is that Castro's crimes now include an illegal inter-

national air assault against American citizens. The reality is that the time is long overdue for serious action against Castro's Cuba. It should not take the murder of four American citizens for the Clinton administration to understand that warming up to Fidel Castro is wrong.

The Clinton administration has been strong in its rhetoric. Yesterday, President Clinton said, the shoot down was a "flagrant violation of international laws \*\*\* and the United States will not tolerate it." But the strong words were not, unfortunately, followed with strong action.

Yes, President Clinton is taking a case to the United Nations to seek international sanctions. I hope the Clinton administration has the same success that the Reagan administration had in 1983 in building an international coalition against the brutal Soviet attack on Korean Airlines flight 007—under the able leadership of U.N. Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick. The Clinton administration has had no success to date in internationalizing the embargo on Cuba. The Clinton administration has spent little time and effort in such efforts, focusing instead on isolating and invading Haiti—the poorest country in the hemisphere.

Yes, President Clinton suspended charter flights to Cuba. But for months, the Clinton administration has looked the other way as the travel ban to Cuba has been regularly violated.

Yes, President Clinton has said there will be further restrictions on Cuban officials in the United States. But these officials are already supposed to be under strict control. And the Clinton administration allowed Fidel Castro to enter the United States last year—to the great satisfaction of the liberal elite who wined and dined the hemisphere's last dictator in New York.

Yes, President Clinton said he wanted to work with Congress to "promptly reach agreement" on legislation to enhance the embargo on Cuba. But the Clinton administration led the charge against such legislation for more than a year—for more than a year—orchestrating a Senate filibuster and issuing veto threats.

I hope the President might now join us. There will be a conference tomorrow morning on the Dole-Helms-Burton bill. We certainly appreciate the President's support.

The Congress is waiting for the Clinton administration to follow through on President Clinton's promise.

Yes, President Clinton said he would support more funding for Radio Marti to break Castro's information stranglehold on the Cuban people. But he was silent about TV Marti, and the Clinton administration has dragged its feet in making the technical improvements to TV Marti which would allow it to be seen by more Cubans.

President Clinton did not even restore the status quo to include sanc-

tions which he eased last year. On October 6, 1995, President Clinton announced a series of steps easing the embargo on Castro's Cuba. At the time, I said the Clinton administration gave Castro a propaganda victory and may have prolonged the Castro dictatorship.

There are many unilateral steps President Clinton could have and should have taken yesterday: Announcing serious enforcement of the travel ban, opening a Treasury Department office in Miami, denying visas for Cuban Government and party officials, and increased Federal Bureau of Investigation actions against Cuban agents in the United States.

But the most important step was not taken—an unequivocal endorsement of the Helms-Dole-Burton Cuban Liberty and Democratic Solidarity Act. This legislation was passed by the Senate on October 19, 1995, by a vote of 74 to 24 and passed by the House 294 to 130 on September 21, 1995. The conference committee will meet tomorrow morning to reconcile differences between the two versions, and I expect Senate action before the end of the week.

The Libertad bill strengthens the embargo on Cuba, offers real incentives for democratic change and takes real action to deter foreign investment in Cuba. The conference legislation will enable American citizens to use American courts to pursue claims against those who use confiscated property in Cuba. The conference legislation will also deny visas to officials who confiscate American property. Finally, the conference report will codify the existing embargo on Cuba, conditioning the end of the embargo on democratic change in Cuba. I also expect the conference report to include a strong condemnation of Castro's terror in the skies.

I know the conferees are receptive to one proposal by President Clinton—authorizing the use of frozen Cuban assets to compensate the families of the latest victims of Castro's regime. That is a good idea. In fact, the conference may look at other uses for the frozen assets—financing Radio and TV Marti, for example, or supporting the democratic opposition in Cuba.

As I indicated earlier, we stand ready to hear from the Clinton administration on the Libertad legislation. I hope President Clinton will finally endorse the tough sanctions that Castro really fears. Then the administration's actions will match their rhetoric.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SANTORUM). Without objection, it is so ordered.

February 27, 1996

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—SENATE

S1341

## SOLICITING STAFF FOR RESEARCH DISCUSSION

Mr. McCAIN. Mr. President, I want to take a minute of the Senate's time to comment on a recent solicitation made to one of my staff members.

I was very concerned to find out that a market research company is calling congressional staffers and offering them \$150 to participate in a research discussion on the subject of spectrum allocation. My staff was told that for spending 2 hours discussing this subject, the individual would either be paid \$150 or could direct the money to be given to the charity of his or her choosing. The meeting, which my staff has declined to attend, is currently scheduled for tomorrow.

Mr. President, I have asked the Ethics Committee to comment on this discussion group offer. They informed my staff that being paid to attend such an event is not allowed.

Based on the Ethics Committee decision, I hope no Senate staff from any office will attend this meeting. What is so disconcerting about this offer is the idea that staff would be paid by an outside source to discuss an issue that will soon be before this body.

As most Members of the Senate know, the broadcast industry has been running full-page ads on the subject and is expected to soon launch a multi-million-dollar media campaign to defeat any effort to mandate spectrum auctions. I support broadcast spectrum auctions and will continue to do that. Others oppose my efforts, and that is their right. In the public forum of the Senate, we will decide what is the right thing to do. As we debate this, we should be careful to live up to the letter and spirit of the gift ban.

I do not know who hired the research company and what games are being orchestrated, but this technique is an insult to the Senate. I hope we will not see this type of lobbying or information gathering again.

I ask unanimous consent that a fax from Shugoll Research Corp. be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHUGOLL RESEARCH,  
Bethesda, MD, February 26, 1996.

To: Grant Seiffert  
Office: Senator McCain  
From: Mrs. Day

We are inviting Capitol Hill staffers to attend a research discussion on behalf of KRC Research & Consulting, a national opinion research organization.

This study focuses on the spectrum allocation debate.

The purpose of this group discussion is purely information-gathering. All comments will be anonymous.

The group will consist of about eight other Hill staffers and a professional moderator who will lead the informal discussion.

The group is being held on Wednesday, February 28th.

Please call us ASAP so we can reserve a space for you.

Our number is (301) 215-7248.

Mr. McCAIN. In summary, I repeat that I am surprised that a company

would offer staffers what would amount to \$75 an hour for discussion of an issue that is going to be before this body. I hope we do not see a repetition of this kind of activity.

I intend to try to find out who hired the Shugoll Research organization to do this, and I intend to publicize that organization because I think it is an unethical act and one that is far beneath certainly the members of the staff of this body.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## THE PEOPLE'S MESSAGE

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, being back in my home State of California is always a marvelous reality check for me. What an honor it is to represent the largest State in the Union, the most diversified State in the Union. We have in that State a tremendous farm community. We have in that State the Silicon Valley. We have more students, we have more seniors, we have more families, we have more working women. We have more of everything—the pluses and the minuses of America: the wealthy, the middle, the poor; the beautiful ocean, the need to preserve that resource, tourism.

Mr. President, what a reality check I got. I went home, I went to schools, from the little kindergarten to graduate schools, to the hospitals, to the chambers of commerce, downtown to the cities, to the suburbs, to meeting with community groups of all kinds, every race, color, and creed, to our beautiful Pacific Ocean, to our facilities in need of earthquake repair, to our farmlands, to our courts, to our young, to our old, to those in between. That is why it is so good to go home and stay in touch.

I hear one message from everyone. This cuts across party lines, it cuts across all lines. That is, "Congress, get on with your work. Take care of this country. Do not play any more games with Government shutdown. Stop being radical. Be reasonable. Meet each other halfway, move forward, do not play games with defaulting. Get on with your work."

It was an amen chorus for me. I agree with that. I told my California citizens, regardless of whether they are Democrats, Republicans, or independents, fighting the battles of the past is not what we ought to be doing. That is what we are doing around here; either fighting the battles of the past—and I will explain what I mean—or we are battling over Whitewater, when people want us to take care of business.

What do I mean when I say we tend to battle over past arguments? It was

during the 1950's that a Republican President named Dwight David Eisenhower said there was an important role for the Federal Government to play in education. He wrote the National Defense Education Act. What it said is that we better make sure that our students are prepared in science, in research. At that time, the Soviet Union was getting ahead, pulling ahead in these arenas. This Republican President said to the Congress that there is a role for the Federal Government to play. It is important for our defense that we have an educated work force, that our young people are skilled.

So we decided in the 1950's that there is, in fact, a place for the Federal Government in education. Does that mean controlling what goes on in the classroom? Of course not. What it means is coming in as a partner where there is a critical need. An example of this today certainly would be continuing Head Start, the title I program, and putting more computers in the schools. These are some areas.

In the 1950's, this role was determined. What is happening now, we have radical elements in the Congress who want to do away with the Department of Education. We would be the only leading power not to have a Department of Education, a place in a national government where this is the focus.

We have people in this body who believe in cutting aid to education, and, in fact, in the last continuing resolution that we passed, if you annualized those cuts, they would be \$3 billion plus. I have to say, as I went around to the schools, they are very upset about this, from the young ones to those in universities. There we are, fighting the battles of the 1950's on education.

Then what happened in the 1960's? In the 1960's, we decided as a nation to start Medicare. It was very controversial at first. The doctors opposed it and said it would be socialized medicine. What is Medicare? It is insurance for our elderly. It took our elderly and gave them health insurance. Now our system is the envy of the world as it relates to seniors—99 percent of our seniors have health insurance. Why are we opening up that battle now in the 1990's? You cannot take \$270 billion out of Medicare and expect it to survive. You cannot get a way out for people to say, "I don't need it. I will set up a medical savings account, drop out of Medicare," and the wealthiest and healthiest will be gone and the system will go under. But we are battling the fight over Medicare.

In the 1970's, under a Republican President, Richard Nixon, we set up the Environmental Protection Agency because the country believed it was important to stand up and protect our heritage. The Environmental Protection Agency—this crowd running this Congress wants to cut enforcement by over a third; some even two-thirds. So we are now battling the fight over